

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/500,360	(06/30/2004	Takanori Otsuhata	TAN-339	2413	
35777	7590	08/25/2005		EXAM	INER	
SHERMAN				HESS, BRUCE H		
,	ORTH ALFRED STREET ANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			1774		

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				/_				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	7				
		10/500,360	OTSUHATA ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Bruce H. Hess	1774	_				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	,				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE								
Status		-/	1.)					
1)	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7.28.05 (a mendment)							
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.						
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
	Claim(s) is/are pending in the applicatio	n						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	6) Claim(s) -3 is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) 🗌	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers							
9) 🗌 .	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
·	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen	t(s)							
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary						
2) Notice	be of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da						

Art Unit: 1774

1. Claims 1-3 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Morita et al. in view of the patent to Tajiri et al. for the reasons of record.

Applicants' assertion to the contrary, Tajiri et al.'s compound of formula (1) can be employed alone as the sole preservability improving agent (see column 7, lines 10 and 11). The fact that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to add the compound of formula (1) to the recording medium of Morita et al. for a different reason (i.e., image preservation) than that of applicants does not render the combination of references improper. Furthermore, even if the compound of formula (1) were to exhibit some color developing function, why would this "destroy the function" of a recording medium that already employs color developers? Applicants' claim language "contains acrylic emulsion and colloidal silica" is of such breadth that it fails to exclude the composite particle emulsion of Morita et al. Finally, the fact that applicants obtain "good" results with their representative examples does not by itself establish that the results are unexpected. Since the comparative examples are not directed to the closest prior art (i.e., the references applied against their claims), the results set forth in Table 1 are not dispositive of the issue of patentability.

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Application/Control Number: 10/500,360 Page 3

Art Unit: 1774

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

BRUCE H. HESS PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1300